

THE GROUND STATE ENERGY OF HEAVY ATOMS: THE LEADING CORRECTION

MICHAEL HANDREK AND HEINZ SIEDENTOP

ABSTRACT. For heavy atoms (large atomic number Z) described by no-pair operators in the Furry picture we find the ground state's leading energy correction. We compare the result with (semi-)empirical values and Schwinger's prediction showing more than qualitative agreement.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
1.1. The Energy Form	3
1.2. Scaling and Units	4
1.3. Main Result	5
2. The Scott Correction of the Hydrogenic Atom: The Shift from Schrödinger to Dirac Energies	5
2.1. Bounds on the Energy Shift	5
2.2. Expectation of the Electric Potential	7
3. Lower Bound on the Energy	7
3.1. Shift from Furry to Thomas-Fermi Picture	8
3.2. Lower Bound in the Thomas-Fermi picture	9
3.3. Difference between Schrödinger and Brown-Ravenhall Energies	10
4. Upper Bound on the Energy	10
4.1. Estimate on the Electric Potential	11
4.2. Estimate on the Projected Dirac-Coulomb Operator	12
4.3. Inserting the Trial Density Matrix	13
5. Finishing the Proof	16
6. Comparison with (Semi-)Empirical Data and Schwinger's Prediction	17
Appendix A. Thomas-Fermi Theory	18
Appendix B. Partial Wave Analysis	19
Appendix C. The Foldy-Wouthuysen Transformation	20
Appendix D. The Trial Density Matrix	21
D.1. Low Angular Momenta	21
D.2. High Angular Momenta	22
References	22

1. INTRODUCTION

Since the advent of quantum mechanics the description of heavy atoms and molecules, in particular their energies, has been of considerable interest in physics, quantum chemistry, and mathematics. However, as in classical mechanics, an explicit treatment beyond one-electron systems is elusive. This spurred the development of effective models of large Coulomb systems starting with Thomas [78],

Date: November 20, 2014.

Fermi [29, 30], and Lenz [46] who formulated the Thomas-Fermi model in the appropriate language of energy functionals. It asserts that in terms of the nuclear charge Z the ground state energy of an atom is of leading order $Z^{7/3}$. That this is only an approximation was clear since the beginning. But it was even doubted that the leading behavior for large Z was correct. In fact, Foldy [31] claimed a $Z^{12/5}$ behavior for large Z based on numerical computations. Scott [64] offered a refined physical argument yielding a positive, additive correction of order Z^2 . The correction originates from the strongly bound electrons which are ill-represented semi-classically. Later Schwinger [62] and Bander [5] gave additional arguments for the validity of the Scott correction. Schwinger [63] and Englert and Schwinger [13, 14, 15] even argued for a $Z^{5/3}$ that can be partially traced back to Dirac [12].

The question whether the conjectured formula for the ground state energy holds asymptotically for the N -electron Schrödinger theory was left unanswered until Lieb and Simon's seminal paper [48] which successfully established the asymptotic correctness of Thomas', Fermi's, and Lenz's prediction. Later the Scott correction for atoms was mathematically confirmed by Hughes [41, 42] (lower bound), and Siedentop and Weikard [66, 67, 68] (lower and upper bound). Eventually, even the existence of a $Z^{5/3}$ -term, the so-called Dirac-Schwinger correction, was proved by Fefferman and Seco in a tour de force [27, 26, 21, 28, 24, 22, 23, 25]. These results were extended in various ways to, e.g., ions and molecules [1, 43, 4].

However, from a physical point of view, it is questionable how these mathematical results reflect reality. It is expected that electrons located close to the nucleus will move at high velocities, thus requiring a relativistic treatment. Already in non-relativistic quantum mechanics the bulk of the electrons are forced on orbits of distances on order $Z^{-1/3}$, the electrons contributing to the Scott correction even live on the scale Z^{-1} . Thus, it is expected that only the latter will generate the leading correction to the non-relativistic ground state energy. Already Schwinger [62] estimated this effect and illustrated that the leading term remains unaffected. Sørensen [57] was the first to put Schwinger's prediction on mathematical ground by showing that the leading Thomas-Fermi term is indeed left unchanged in the limit of large nuclear charge Z and large speed of light c when replacing the non-relativistic Hamiltonian by the Chandrasekhar (or pseudo-relativistic) Hamiltonian. Subsequently, the Scott correction for the Chandrasekhar model was again proved to be of order Z^2 by Sørensen [56] (non-interacting case) and Solovej, Sørensen and Spitzer [70] (interacting case). A short alternative proof was given by Frank, Siedentop, and Warzel [34]. By going from the non-relativistic Schrödinger theory to the pseudo-relativistic Chandrasekhar theory one observes a lowering of the leading energy correction.

Despite the mathematical success in establishing the large Z -asymptotics for this simplified relativistic model, it is still desirable to examine models that not only represent qualitative features of relativistic systems but are also expected to be quantitatively correct. In particular, the pseudo-relativistic theory fails to reproduce the energies of hydrogen-like atoms. In fact, it predicts collapse of the innermost electron for Ra ($Z = 88$) and beyond, i.e., it does not even allow to treat very large atoms. For this matter it is believed to be necessary to study Hamiltonians that are derived directly from QED, among them the so called no-pair operators [74, 75, 76]. The most simple of those models has been introduced by Brown and Ravenhall [7]. In analogy to the Schrödinger and Chandrasekhar theory, Cassanas and Siedentop [9] proved that to leading order this model has no effect on the energy asymptotics. In a further step Frank, Siedentop, and Warzel [35] established the Scott correction for this model as well. However, although the Brown-Ravenhall model raises the energies of the Chandrasekhar model, it

nevertheless – even in the one-particle picture – predicts still too low energies. In consequence, the Scott correction which is determined by the pure unscreened Coulomb potential is too small. In fact, the energy becomes unbounded from below at about $Z = 124$, which is higher than any known element, but nevertheless lower than the expected value 137.

In passing we would like to mention two recent results on the inclusion of the self-generated magnetic field (quantized or not): it turns out that it does not affect the leading order (Erdős and Solovej [19]). In fact the Scott term is not affected in the Chandrasekhar model either whereas in the non-relativistic setting – which is expected to be unphysical because of the argument mentioned above – the Scott term would be changed [16, 18, 17]. This and corresponding numerical results motivate us, to drop the self-generated magnetic fields in this paper.

Despite the shortcomings of the original Brown-Ravenhall model, it is known that no-pair operators reproduce relativistic effects in a quantitative correct manner [40], when taking into account the external potential in determining the electron space (Furry picture) [40, 59]. Physically this is reasonable since the first order correction stemming from the innermost electrons is now derived from the Dirac equation with the unscreened Coulomb potential. This is actually the underlying physical argument for Schwinger's [62] relativistic correction.

1.1. The Energy Form. The relativistic description of an electron moving in the potential of a static nucleus of charge Z and a mean-field potential χ is given by the Dirac operator

$$(1) \quad D_{\gamma, \chi} = \boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{p} + \beta - \frac{\gamma}{|\mathbf{x}|} + \chi$$

with $\gamma = Z/c$ in units of mc^2 and $\mathbf{p} := (1/i)\nabla$. This operator is self-adjointly realized in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3 : \mathbb{C}^4)$. Here

$$(2) \quad \boldsymbol{\alpha} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \boldsymbol{\sigma} \\ \boldsymbol{\sigma} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \beta = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\sigma} = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3)$ are the three Pauli matrices in standard representation. A physical example for χ would be the screening mean-field potential of the electrons. We will assume that χ is a bounded operator. Assuming $\gamma := Z/c \in (-1, 1)$, Nenciu [55] showed that $D_{\gamma, \chi}$ defined on $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^3 : \mathbb{C}^4)$ has a distinguished self-adjoint extension whose domain includes $H^1(\mathbb{R}^3 : \mathbb{C}^4)$ and whose form domain is $H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^3 : \mathbb{C}^4)$. By the usual abuse of notation we do no longer distinguish notationally between the original operator and its extension. Moreover, we write $D_\gamma := D_{\gamma, 0}$ for the pure Coulomb-Dirac operator without screening.

The energy form $\mathcal{E}^N$ on $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^{3N} : \mathbb{C}^{4N})$ is

$$(3) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}^N[\Psi] &:= c^2 \left\langle \Psi, \left(\sum_{\nu=1}^N (D_\gamma - 1)_\nu + \sum_{1 \leq \mu < \nu \leq N} \frac{\alpha}{|\mathbf{x}_\nu - \mathbf{x}_\mu|} \right) \Psi \right\rangle \\ &= \left\langle V_c \Psi, \left(\sum_{\nu=1}^N (c\boldsymbol{\alpha}_\nu \cdot \mathbf{p}_\nu + c^2\beta_\nu - \frac{Z}{|\mathbf{x}_\nu|} - c^2) + \sum_{1 \leq \mu < \nu \leq N} \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x}_\nu - \mathbf{x}_\mu|} \right) V_c \Psi \right\rangle \end{aligned}$$

where $\alpha := e^2/(\hbar c)$, i.e., $\alpha = 1/c$ in our units, is the Sommerfeld fine structure constant. The scaling map V_c will be defined in section 1.2.

Since electrons are fermions, we will restrict the domain to antisymmetric spinors Ψ . Moreover, in the spirit of Dirac's postulate of a filled Dirac sea, Brown and

Ravenhall [7] and later Sucher [75, 76], extending this idea, formulated this mathematically by requiring that the one-electron space is given by the positive spectral subspace of a suitable Dirac operator. Typical choices for such operators:

Free picture (Brown and Ravenhall [7]): The free Dirac operator, i.e., D_0 with

$$\mathfrak{H}_0 := \Lambda_0(L^2(\mathbb{R}^3 : \mathbb{C}^4)) := \mathbb{1}_{(0,\infty)}(D_0)(L^2(\mathbb{R}^3 : \mathbb{C}^4)).$$

Furry picture (Furry and Oppenheimer [36]): The Dirac operator with the external potential, i.e., D_γ with

$$\mathfrak{H}_\gamma := \Lambda_\gamma(L^2(\mathbb{R}^3 : \mathbb{C}^4)) := \mathbb{1}_{(0,\infty)}(D_\gamma)(L^2(\mathbb{R}^3 : \mathbb{C}^4)).$$

Intermediate or Fuzzy picture (Mittleman [54]): The intermediate picture with some screening potential χ , e.g. it may be picked as the mean-field potential of the Dirac-Hartree-Fock equations. An optimal choice, which depends on the two-particle density matrix, was suggested by Mittleman. This leads to a non-linear equation, which has been studied numerically with great success in quantum chemistry, see, e.g., Saue [60].

We will pick χ to be the rescaled Thomas-Fermi screening potential reduced by the exchange hole (see (20)), i.e., $D_{\gamma,\chi}$, with the corresponding one-particle Hilbert space is

$$\mathfrak{H}_{\gamma,\chi} := \Lambda_{\gamma,\chi}(L^2(\mathbb{R}^3 : \mathbb{C}^4)) := \mathbb{1}_{(0,\infty)}(D_{\gamma,\chi})(L^2(\mathbb{R}^3 : \mathbb{C}^4)).$$

The corresponding N particle Hilbert spaces are $\mathfrak{H}_\#^N := \bigwedge_{\nu=1}^N \mathfrak{H}_\#$ where $\#$ either denotes the free picture, i.e., $\# = "0"$, the Furry picture, i.e., $\# = "\gamma"$, or our choice of the intermediate picture, i.e., $\# = "\gamma, \chi"$. Because of Nenciu's result as described above [55],

$$\Lambda_\#(\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^3 : \mathbb{C}^4)) \subset H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^3 : \mathbb{C}^4)$$

and dense in $\Lambda_\#(L^2(\mathbb{R}^3 : \mathbb{C}^4))$. Thus, the functional $\mathcal{E}_\#^N := \mathcal{E}^N|_{\bigwedge_{\nu=1}^N (\Lambda_\#(\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^3 : \mathbb{C}^4)))}$ is well defined for $\gamma \in [0, 1)$ and bounded screening potential, i.e., in particular for our choice.

The above quadratic forms are bounded from below under suitable constraints on γ , and thus define according to Friedrichs a distinguished self-adjoint operator. In particular this holds, if

Brown-Ravenhall: $\gamma \leq \gamma_{crit}^B = \frac{2}{2/\pi + \pi/2}$ (Evans et al [20]).

Furry and Intermediate: $\gamma < 1$ (Nenciu [55]).

Matte and Stockmeyer [51] have worked out the detailed structure of the spectrum of such no-pair operators.

1.2. Scaling and Units. The technical necessity of the limit $Z \rightarrow \infty$ only being possible in the simultaneous limit $c \rightarrow \infty$ such that $\gamma = \frac{Z}{c} \rightarrow C < 1$ suggests that the appropriate units are chosen as in (1). To draw a connection to the usual Schrödinger operator of hydrogen

$$(4) \quad \frac{\mathbf{p}^2}{2} - \frac{Z}{|\mathbf{x}|}$$

it will be useful to consider the unitary scaling operator V_c on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^{3N} : \mathbb{C}^{4N})$ defined by

$$(5) \quad (V_c \psi)(\mathbf{x}) := c^{-\frac{3}{2}} \psi\left(\frac{\mathbf{x}}{c}\right)$$

such that

$$(6) \quad c^2 \left\langle \psi, \left(\boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{p} + \beta - \frac{\gamma}{|\mathbf{x}|} \right) \psi \right\rangle = \left\langle V_c \psi, \left(c \boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{p} + c^2 \beta - \frac{Z}{|\mathbf{x}|} \right) V_c \psi \right\rangle.$$

1.3. Main Result. Ground state energies of neutral atoms in no-pair pictures are given by

$$(7) \quad E_{\#}(Z) := \inf\{\mathcal{E}^Z[\psi] \mid \psi \in \mathfrak{Q}_{\#}^Z, \|\psi\| = 1\}$$

where $\mathfrak{Q}_{\gamma}^Z := \mathfrak{H}_{\gamma}^Z \cap \bigwedge_{\nu=1}^Z (\Lambda_{\#}(\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^3 : \mathbb{C}^4)))$.

For the Brown-Ravenhall operator, i.e., $\#$ set to 0, Cassanas and Siedentop [9] proved that the leading order term is given by the Thomas-Fermi energy $\mathcal{E}^{\text{TF}}$ (see Appendix A), i.e.,

$$(8) \quad E_0(Z) = E_{\text{TF}}(1)Z^{7/3} + o(Z^{7/3}).$$

Furthermore, Frank et al [35] found the leading correction. It is given by the spectral shift function $s^B(\gamma)$ for $\gamma \in (0, \gamma_{\text{crit}}^B]$, i.e., the difference of bound state energies of the one-particle Brown-Ravenhall operator and Schrödinger operator.

This paper concerns the analogous result in the case of the Furry picture, i.e., $\#$ replaced by γ . In this case we are in the fortunate situation that the eigenvalues of the one-particle Furry operator are explicitly known. They are identical to the eigenvalues λ_n^D (labeled in increasing order) of the Dirac-Coulomb operator $D_{\gamma} - 1$. Likewise, denoting the eigenvalues of the hydrogen Schrödinger operator $(\mathbf{p}^2/2 - \gamma/|\mathbf{x}|) \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{C}^2}$ in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3 : \mathbb{C}^2)$ by λ_n^S , we can write down rather explicitly a new spectral shift function

$$(9) \quad s^D(\gamma) := \frac{1}{\gamma^2} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (\lambda_n^D - \lambda_n^S)$$

for $\gamma \in (0, 1)$.

We are now ready to state the main theorem.

Theorem 1 (Scott correction). *There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $Z > 0$ and $\gamma = \frac{Z}{c} < 1$ one has*

$$(10) \quad \left| E_{\gamma}(Z) - E_{\text{TF}}(Z) - \left(\frac{1}{2} + s^D(\gamma) \right) Z^2 \right| \leq CZ^{47/24}.$$

Put differently, Theorem 1 asserts that in the limit $Z \rightarrow \infty$ one has

$$(11) \quad E_{\gamma}(Z) = E_{\text{TF}}(Z) + \left(\frac{1}{2} + s^D(\gamma) \right) Z^2 + o(Z^2)$$

uniformly in $\gamma = \frac{Z}{c} < 1$.

2. THE SCOTT CORRECTION OF THE HYDROGENIC ATOM: THE SHIFT FROM SCHRÖDINGER TO DIRAC ENERGIES

Since the Scott correction results from the innermost electrons, it is not only intuitively obvious that the Scott corrections can be computed for atoms whose electrons do not interact with each other; it is also important for obtaining the Scott correction in the interacting case. To turn this intuition into a proof, we estimate the difference of Dirac and Schrödinger eigenvalues for hydrogenic atoms and exhibit the leading correction to the non-relativistic correction $Z^2/2$.

2.1. Bounds on the Energy Shift. We denote by $\lambda_{\gamma,n,l,j}^D$ the n^{th} eigenvalue of the operator $D_{\gamma} - 1$ for $0 \leq \gamma < 1$ restricted to the angular momentum subspace $\mathfrak{H}_{j,l,m}$ (note that the eigenvalue does not depend on the azimuthal quantum number m). We write $\lambda_{\gamma,n,l}^S$ for the n^{th} eigenvalue of the operator $\mathbf{p}^2/2 - \gamma/|\mathbf{x}|$ restricted to $|Y_{l,m}\rangle \langle Y_{l,m}| L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$. They are given by Sommerfeld's fine structure formula [71]

(Gordon [37], and Darwin [10]) and Balmer's formula [3] (Schrödinger [61]) (see Bethe [6] for a concise treatment)

$$\begin{aligned}
 \lambda_{\gamma,n,l,j}^D &= \left(1 - \frac{\gamma^2}{\left(n+l - (j + \frac{1}{2}) + \sqrt{(j + \frac{1}{2})^2 - \gamma^2} \right)^2 + \gamma^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} - 1 \\
 (12) \quad &= \left(1 - \frac{\gamma^2}{(n+l)^2 - 2(n+l - (j + \frac{1}{2}))(j + \frac{1}{2} - \sqrt{(j + \frac{1}{2})^2 - \gamma^2})} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} - 1 \\
 \lambda_{\gamma,n,l}^S &= -\frac{\gamma^2}{2(n+l)^2}
 \end{aligned}$$

(Gordon [37], Expanding the square root in (12) and using the fact that $\sqrt{1-x} < 1 - x/2$ for $x \in (0, 1]$ we have

$$(13) \quad \lambda_{\gamma,n,l,j}^D < \lambda_{\gamma,n,l}^S < 0.$$

Moreover, for fixed l and n the dimension of the Dirac eigenspace is $2(2l+1)$ (see (95)) and the dimension of the Schrödinger eigenspace is $2l+1$.

Lemma 1. *Assume $\gamma_0 < 1$. Then there exists a constant $C \in \mathbb{R}$ such that for all $l \in \mathbb{N}$, $j = l \pm 1/2$, $j \geq 1/2$, and $\gamma \in [0, \gamma_0)$*

$$(14) \quad \left| \lambda_{\gamma,n,l,j}^D - \lambda_{\gamma,n,l}^S + \frac{\gamma^4}{2(n+l)^3} \left(\frac{1}{j + \frac{1}{2}} - \frac{3}{4} \frac{1}{n+l} \right) \right| \leq C \frac{\gamma^6}{(n+l)^4}.$$

Proof. Note that

$$(15) \quad \frac{1}{2}(n+l)^2 \leq (n+l)^2 - 2(n+l - (j + \frac{1}{2}))(j + \frac{1}{2} - \sqrt{(j + \frac{1}{2})^2 - \gamma^2}) \leq (n+l)^2.$$

Expanding the square root gives sufficient error estimates:

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\left(1 - \frac{\gamma^2}{(n+l)^2 - 2(n+l - (j + \frac{1}{2}))(j + \frac{1}{2} - \sqrt{(j + \frac{1}{2})^2 - \gamma^2})} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
 &= 1 - \frac{\gamma^2}{2 \left((n+l)^2 - 2(n+l - (j + \frac{1}{2}))(j + \frac{1}{2} - \sqrt{(j + \frac{1}{2})^2 - \gamma^2}) \right)} \\
 &\quad - \frac{\gamma^4}{8 \left((n+l)^2 - 2(n+l - (j + \frac{1}{2}))(j + \frac{1}{2} - \sqrt{(j + \frac{1}{2})^2 - \gamma^2}) \right)^2} + \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{\gamma^6}{(n+l)^6} \right) \\
 &= 1 - \frac{\gamma^2}{2(n+l)^2} - \frac{\gamma^4}{2(n+l)^4} \frac{n+l - (j + \frac{1}{2})}{j + \frac{1}{2}} \\
 &\quad - \frac{\gamma^4}{8 \left((n+l)^2 - 2(n+l - (j + \frac{1}{2}))(j + \frac{1}{2} - \sqrt{(j + \frac{1}{2})^2 - \gamma^2}) \right)^2} \\
 &\quad + \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{\gamma^6 n}{(n+l)^4 (l+1)^2} \right)
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= 1 - \frac{\gamma^2}{2(n+l)^2} - \frac{\gamma^4}{2(n+l)^4} \frac{n+l-(j+\frac{1}{2})}{j+\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\quad - \frac{\gamma^4}{8(n+l)^2} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\gamma^6 n}{(n+l)^4(l+1)}\right) \\
&= 1 - \frac{\gamma^2}{2(n+l)^2} - \frac{\gamma^4}{2(n+l)^3} \left(\frac{1}{j+\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{3}{4} \frac{1}{n+l}\right) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\gamma^6 n}{(n+l)^4(l+1)}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

□

For our application it is convenient to simplify the estimate.

Corollary 1. *Under the assumptions of Lemma 1 we have*

$$(16) \quad 0 \leq \lambda_{\gamma,n,l}^S - \lambda_{\gamma,n,l,j}^D \leq \frac{C\gamma^4}{(n+l)^3 l}.$$

2.2. Expectation of the Electric Potential. We need an estimate on the expectation value of the Coulomb potential in eigenstates of the Coulomb-Dirac operator. In the non-relativistic case the virial theorem yields immediately $\langle \psi, \gamma/|\mathbf{x}| \psi \rangle = \gamma^2(n+l)^{-2}$. In the relativistic case explicit computation (Burke and Grant [8]) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&\langle \psi_{n,l,j}, \frac{\gamma}{|\mathbf{x}|} \psi_{n,l,j} \rangle \\
(17) \quad &= \gamma^2 \frac{(j+\frac{1}{2})^2 + (n+l-(j+\frac{1}{2}))\sqrt{(j+\frac{1}{2})^2 - \gamma^2}}{\sqrt{(j+\frac{1}{2})^2 - \gamma^2}((\sqrt{(j+\frac{1}{2})^2 - \gamma^2} + n+l-(j+\frac{1}{2}))^2 + \gamma^2)^{\frac{3}{2}}}.
\end{aligned}$$

This formula would also follow from hypervirial theorems (see, e.g., [65]).

Lemma 2. *Pick $\gamma_0 \in (0, 1)$. Given $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $j \in \mathbb{N} - 1/2$, $l = j \pm 1/2$, $m = -j, \dots, j$, and $\gamma \in (0, \gamma_0]$. Let $\psi_{n,l,j,m}$ denote an eigenfunction with eigenvalue $\lambda_{\gamma,n,l,j}^D$. Then there is a constant C_{γ_0} such that*

$$(18) \quad \langle \psi_{n,l,j}, \frac{\gamma}{|\mathbf{x}|} \psi_{n,l,j} \rangle \leq \frac{C_{\gamma_0} \gamma^2}{(n+l)^2}.$$

Proof. The claim follows by noting that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{\sqrt{(j+\frac{1}{2})^2 - \gamma^2}} \leq \frac{1}{j+\frac{1}{2} - \gamma} \leq \frac{1}{(1-\gamma)(j+\frac{1}{2})}, \\
&\frac{1}{(\sqrt{(j+\frac{1}{2})^2 - \gamma^2} + n+l-(j+\frac{1}{2}))^2 + \gamma^2} \leq \frac{2}{(n+l)^2}, \\
&(j+\frac{1}{2})^2 + (n+l-(j+\frac{1}{2}))\sqrt{(j+\frac{1}{2})^2 - \gamma^2} \leq (n+l)(j+\frac{1}{2}).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Note that the restriction $\gamma \leq \gamma_0$ is only relevant for $j = \frac{1}{2}$.

3. LOWER BOUND ON THE ENERGY

To prove a lower bound on the energy we will reduce the multi-particle operator to an effective one-particle operator via the pointwise correlation inequality of Mancas et al [50] in the appropriately rescaled version $x \rightarrow x/c$, i.e.,

$$(19) \quad \sum_{1 \leq \nu < \mu \leq N} \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x}_\nu - \mathbf{x}_\mu|} \geq \sum_{\nu=1}^N \chi(\mathbf{x}_\nu) - c^{-1} D[\rho_Z^{\text{TF}}].$$

Here χ denotes the rescaled screening part of the Thomas-Fermi potential reduced by the exchange hole, i.e.,

$$(20) \quad \chi(\mathbf{x}) = c^{-4} \int_{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}| > R_Z(\mathbf{x}/c)} \frac{\rho_Z^{\text{TF}}(c^{-1}\mathbf{y})}{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|} d\mathbf{y}$$

with R_Z being the unique minimal radius such that

$$(21) \quad \int_{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}| \leq R_Z(\mathbf{x})} \rho_Z^{\text{TF}}(\mathbf{y}) d\mathbf{y} = \frac{1}{2},$$

and

$$(22) \quad D[\rho] := \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{\rho(\mathbf{x})\rho(\mathbf{y})}{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|} d\mathbf{x}d\mathbf{y}$$

is the classical energy of a charge density ρ . (The corresponding sesquilinear form is denoted by $D(\rho, \sigma)$.) Of course,

$$(23) \quad 0 < \chi(\mathbf{x}) < \frac{1}{c^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} d\mathbf{y} \frac{\rho_Z^{\text{TF}}(\mathbf{y})}{|c^{-1}\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|}$$

and in particular

$$(24) \quad \|\chi\|_\infty \leq CZ^{\frac{4}{3}}c^{-2}$$

for some constant $C > 0$. Thus, to estimate the form $\mathcal{E}_\gamma^N$ from below, it suffices to bound

$$(25) \quad \mathcal{F}(d) := \text{tr}((D_{\gamma,\chi} - 1)d) - c^{-2}D[\rho_Z^{\text{TF}}]$$

with d a one-particle density matrix on $\mathfrak{H}_\gamma$ of particle number not exceeding N , and of finite kinetic energy, i.e., $0 \leq d \leq 1$, $\text{tr}d \leq N$, and $\text{tr}(|\mathbf{p}|d) < \infty$.

We now use that χ is spherically symmetric and therefore D_γ^χ commutes with the total angular momentum $\mathbf{J}$ and we split the trace into angular momentum channels, i.e.,

$$(26) \quad \mathcal{F}(d) \geq \sum_{\substack{l,j \\ l \leq L}} \text{tr}_{j,l}((D_\gamma - 1)d) + \sum_{\substack{l,j \\ l > L}} \text{tr}_{j,l}((D_{\gamma,\chi} - 1)d) - c^{-2}D[\rho_Z^{\text{TF}}],$$

since the projections $\Lambda_\#$ commute with the projections on the subspaces $\mathfrak{h}_{j,l}$ (see appendix B), i.e.,

$$(27) \quad \Pi_{j,l}\Lambda_\# = \Lambda_\#\Pi_{j,l}.$$

The parameter L will later be specified to give the desired lower bound.

3.1. Shift from Furry to Thomas-Fermi Picture. To prove a lower bound we use a uniform estimate on the difference between the Furry and the Thomas-Fermi picture.

Lemma 3. *Assume $\gamma < 1$. Then for every state $\psi \in \Lambda_\gamma H^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C}^4)$*

$$(28) \quad 0 \geq \langle \psi, [D_{\gamma,\chi} - 1 - \Lambda_{\gamma,\chi}(D_{\gamma,\chi} - 1)\Lambda_{\gamma,\chi}] \psi \rangle \geq -\frac{\pi^2 + B(\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2})^2}{4\pi^2(1 - \gamma^2)} \|\chi\|_\infty^2 \|\psi\|^2$$

Note that the lemma generalizes to more general positive operators χ .

Proof. The expression to be estimated can be written as a manifestly negative term

$$0 \geq \langle \psi, (D_{\gamma,\chi,-} - \Lambda_{\gamma,\chi}^\perp) \psi \rangle = \langle \psi, ((\Lambda_\gamma - \Lambda_{\gamma,\chi})(D_{\gamma,\chi,-} - \Lambda_{\gamma,\chi}^\perp)(\Lambda_\gamma - \Lambda_{\gamma,\chi}) \psi) \rangle.$$

(In our convention the negative part A_- of a self-adjoint operator A is negative.) By the usual integral representation for $\text{sgn}(x)$, the resolvent identity, and the spectral theorem we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \psi, (\Lambda_\gamma - \Lambda_{\gamma,\chi}) | D_{\gamma,\chi,-} | (\Lambda_\gamma - \Lambda_{\gamma,\chi}) \psi \rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^2} d\mu d\nu \langle \psi, \frac{1}{D_\gamma + i\mu} \chi \frac{1}{D_{\gamma,\chi,-} + i\mu} | D_{\gamma,\chi,-} | \frac{1}{D_{\gamma,\chi,-} + i\nu} \chi \frac{1}{D_\gamma + i\nu} \psi \rangle \\ &\leq \left(\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} d\nu \left\| \frac{|D_{\gamma,\chi,-}|^{\frac{1}{2}}}{D_{\gamma,\chi,-} + i\nu} \chi \frac{1}{D_\gamma + i\nu} \Lambda_\gamma \psi \right\| \right)^2 \leq \left(\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} d\nu \frac{\|\chi\|_\infty \|\psi\|}{\sqrt{\langle \nu \rangle} \sqrt{1 - \gamma^2 + \nu^2}} \right)^2 \\ &\leq (1 - \gamma^2)^{-1/2} \frac{B(\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2})^2}{4\pi^2} \|\chi\|_\infty^2 \|\psi\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

using the Schwarz inequality in the first estimate.

A similar estimate yields

$$\langle \psi, (\Lambda_\gamma - \Lambda_{\gamma,\chi}) \Lambda_{\gamma,\chi}^\perp (\Lambda_\gamma - \Lambda_{\gamma,\chi}) \psi \rangle \leq \frac{1}{4} (1 - \gamma^2)^{-1} \|\chi\|_\infty^2.$$

□

3.2. Lower Bound in the Thomas-Fermi picture. Lemma 3 and (26) allow to write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_\gamma^N[\psi]/c^2 &\geq \sum_{l \leq L} \sum_{j=l \pm \frac{1}{2}, j \geq 0} \text{tr}_{j,l}([\Lambda_\gamma(D_\gamma - 1)\Lambda_\gamma]_-) - C \frac{Z^{8/3}N}{c^4} \\ &\quad + \sum_{L < l \leq N} \sum_{j=l \pm \frac{1}{2}, j \geq 0} \text{tr}_{j,l}([\Lambda_{\gamma,\chi}(D_{\gamma,\chi} - 1)\Lambda_{\gamma,\chi}]_-) - D(\rho_Z^{\text{TF}}, \rho_Z^{\text{TF}}). \end{aligned}$$

By the min-max principle for operators with spectral gaps [39], we have

$$(29) \quad \lambda_{n,j,l,m}(\Lambda_{\gamma,\chi}(D_{\gamma,\chi} - 1)\Lambda_{\gamma,\chi}) \geq \lambda_{n,j,l,m}(\Lambda_0(D_{\gamma,\chi} - 1)\Lambda_0)$$

for $l \geq 1$ and $\gamma < 1$, since the proof of Griesemer et al [39] extends to higher coupling constants. In particular, the condition

$$\|(|D_0| + 1)^{1/2} \Lambda_0 \Lambda_{\gamma,\chi} (|D_0| + 1)^{-1/2}\|_{j,l} < 1$$

of [39, Theorem 1] is readily verified for $j \geq \frac{3}{2}$ following the proof of [39, Theorem 2] and using Hardy's inequality in angular momentum channel l' ,

$$(30) \quad \mathbf{p}^2 \geq \frac{(l' + \frac{1}{2})^2}{|\mathbf{x}|^2},$$

i.e.,

$$(31) \quad \mathbf{p}^2 \geq \frac{j^2}{|\mathbf{x}|^2}$$

in the subspaces $\mathfrak{h}_{j,l}$. Note that although the subspaces $\mathfrak{h}_{j,l}$ are not eigenspaces of the angular momentum operator $\mathbf{L}$, they only contain functions with orbital angular momentum larger than $j - \frac{1}{2}$.

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_\gamma^N[\psi]/c^2 &\geq \sum_{l \leq L} \sum_{j=l \pm \frac{1}{2}, j \geq 0} \text{tr}_{j,l}([\Lambda_\gamma(D_\gamma - 1)\Lambda_\gamma]_-) - C \frac{Z^{8/3}N}{c^4} \\ (32) \quad &\quad + \sum_{L < l \leq N} \sum_{j=l \pm \frac{1}{2}, j \geq 0} \text{tr}_{j,l}([\Lambda_0(D_\gamma + \chi - 1)\Lambda_0]_-) - D[\rho_Z^{\text{TF}}]. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the detour via the projections $\Lambda_{\gamma,\chi}$ was central to our argument, since although we have

$$(33) \quad \lambda_{n,j,l,m}(\Lambda_\gamma(D_\gamma - 1)\Lambda_\gamma) \geq \lambda_{n,j,l,m}(\Lambda_0(D_\gamma - 1)\Lambda_0).$$

by the same arguments as above, it is however not clear whether

$$(34) \quad \lambda_{n,j,l,m}(\Lambda_\gamma(D_{\gamma,\chi} - 1)\Lambda_\gamma) \geq \lambda_{n,j,l,m}(\Lambda_0(D_{\gamma,\chi} - 1)\Lambda_0),$$

because of the (albeit small) perturbation χ .

3.3. Difference between Schrödinger and Brown-Ravenhall Energies. We will now compare the lower bound in (32) with the non-relativistic atomic energy, which as the proof of the Scott correction for the Brown Ravenhall operator in [35] shows, is given – for $N = Z$ and $L = [Z^{1/12}]$ – by

$$(35) \quad \begin{aligned} E_S^Z = & -2 \sum_{l=0}^{L-1} (2l+1) \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{Z^2}{2(n+l)^2} - D[\rho_Z^{\text{TF}}] \\ & + c^2 \sum_{l=L}^Z \sum_{j=l \pm \frac{1}{2}, j \geq 0} \text{tr}_{j,l}([\Lambda_0(D_{\gamma,\chi} - 1)\Lambda_0]_-) + \mathcal{O}(Z^{\frac{5}{3}}). \end{aligned}$$

In particular, the extension of Theorem 3.1 in [35] to all $\gamma < 1$ for higher momentum channels is again easily achieved by exploiting inequality 31 such that we have

Theorem 2. [35, Theorem 3.1] *There exists a constant $C < \infty$ such that for any $\gamma \leq 1$ $v : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$, satisfying*

$$(36) \quad v(r) \leq \frac{\gamma}{r},$$

any $\mu > 0$ and any $l \in \mathbb{N}$, $j = l \pm \frac{1}{2}$ one has

$$(37) \quad \text{tr}_{j,l}[\Lambda_0(D_0 - v(|\mathbf{x}|))\Lambda_0 - 1 + \mu]_- - \text{tr}_l \left[\frac{\mathbf{p}^2}{2} - v(|\mathbf{x}|) + \mu \right]_- \leq C \frac{\gamma^4}{j^2}.$$

Combining inequality 32 and equality 35 with the known asymptotic expansion of the non-relativistic ground state energy gives the desired lower bound for the Furry Hamiltonian.

4. UPPER BOUND ON THE ENERGY

In this section we will derive a sufficient decay of the difference of the Furry and Brown-Ravenhall operators when restricted to angular momentum l . For high angular momenta, up to an error of lower order the Furry picture will then be replaced by the Brown-Ravenhall picture which in turn was shown to give the correct upper bound in [35]. We will frequently use the following inequality.

Lemma 4. *Assume $j \geq \frac{3}{2}$ and $\gamma \leq 1$. In $\mathfrak{H}_{j,l}$*

$$(38) \quad \left\| |D_0|^{\frac{1}{2}} |D_\gamma|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{j,l} \leq \sqrt{\frac{j}{j-\gamma}}.$$

Proof. Note that $|D_0| = \sqrt{\mathbf{p}^2 + 1}$ and

$$(39) \quad \left\| |D_0|^{\frac{1}{2}} |D_\gamma|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{j,l} = \sup_{\psi \in \Pi_{j,l} C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C}^4)} \frac{\left\| |D_0|^{\frac{1}{2}} \psi \right\|_2}{\left\| |D_\gamma|^{\frac{1}{2}} \psi \right\|_2}.$$

Squaring the operators yields

$$\begin{aligned}
 (40) \quad & \| |D_\gamma| \psi \|_{j,l} = \left\| \left(D_0 - \frac{\gamma}{|\mathbf{x}|} \right) \psi \right\|_{j,l} \\
 & \geq \| |D_0| \psi \|_{j,l} - \left\| \frac{\gamma}{|\mathbf{x}|} \psi \right\|_{j,l} \geq \left(1 - \frac{\gamma}{j} \right) \| |D_0| \psi \|_{j,l}
 \end{aligned}$$

The claim follows from the operator monotony of the square root. $\square$

4.1. Estimate on the Electric Potential. We will now show that for high angular momenta the expectation value of the potential in the Furry picture is close to that in the Brown-Ravenhall picture.

Lemma 5. *Let $j \geq \frac{3}{2}$, $\psi \in \Pi_{j,l} H^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C}^4)$, $-\frac{1}{|\mathbf{x}|} \leq \phi(\mathbf{x}) \leq \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x}|}$, $\gamma < 1$. Then*

$$(41) \quad |\langle \psi, (\Lambda_\gamma \phi \Lambda_\gamma - \Lambda_0 \phi \Lambda_0) \psi \rangle| \leq \frac{C}{l^2} \langle \psi, \mathbf{p}^2 \psi \rangle.$$

Proof. The proof follows loosely the arguments found in [39].

One has

$$(42) \quad \begin{aligned} & |\langle \psi, (\Lambda_\gamma \phi \Lambda_\gamma - \Lambda_0 \phi \Lambda_0) \psi \rangle| \\ & \leq 2 \underbrace{|\langle \psi, (\Lambda_\gamma - \Lambda_0) \phi \Lambda_0 \psi \rangle|}_I + \underbrace{|\langle \psi, (\Lambda_\gamma - \Lambda_0) \phi (\Lambda_\gamma - \Lambda_0) \psi \rangle|}_{II}. \end{aligned}$$

The second resolvent identity gives

$$\begin{aligned}
 (43) \quad \Lambda_0 - \Lambda_\gamma &= -\frac{\gamma}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dz \frac{1}{D_0 - iz} \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x}|} \frac{1}{D_\gamma - iz} \\
 &= -\frac{\gamma}{\pi} \int_0^{\infty} dz \frac{1}{D_0^2 + z^2} \left(D_0 \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x}|} D_\gamma - \frac{z^2}{|\mathbf{x}|} \right) \frac{1}{D_\gamma^2 + z^2}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Term I :

$$\begin{aligned}
 (44) \quad & |\langle \psi, (\Lambda_\gamma - \Lambda_0) \phi \Lambda_0 \psi \rangle| \\
 &= |\langle \psi, \frac{\gamma}{\pi} \int_0^{\infty} dz \frac{1}{D_0^2 + z^2} \left(D_0 \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x}|} D_\gamma - \frac{z^2}{|\mathbf{x}|} \right) \frac{1}{D_\gamma^2 + z^2} \phi \Lambda_0 \psi \rangle|.
 \end{aligned}$$

The first summand on the right side of (44) is estimated as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
 (45) \quad & |\langle \psi, \frac{\gamma}{\pi} \int_0^{\infty} dz \frac{1}{D_0^2 + z^2} D_0 \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x}|} D_\gamma \frac{1}{D_\gamma^2 + z^2} \phi \Lambda_0 \psi \rangle| \\
 & \leq \frac{\gamma}{\pi} \left[\int_0^{\infty} dz \left\| \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x}|} D_0 \frac{1}{D_0^2 + z^2} \psi \right\|^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \left[\int_0^{\infty} dz \left\| D_\gamma \frac{1}{D_\gamma^2 + z^2} \phi \Lambda_0 \psi \right\|^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$(46) \quad \int_0^{\infty} dz \frac{1}{(1+z^2)^2} = \int_0^{\infty} dz \frac{z^2}{(1+z^2)^2} = \frac{\pi}{4}.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
 (47) \quad & \int_0^{\infty} dz \left\| \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x}|} D_0 \frac{1}{D_0^2 + z^2} \psi \right\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{j^2} \int_0^{\infty} dz \left\| |\mathbf{p}| |D_0| \frac{1}{D_0^2 + z^2} \psi \right\|^2 \\
 & \leq \frac{\pi}{4j^2} \left\| |\mathbf{p}| |D_0|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \psi \right\|^2 \leq \frac{\pi}{4j^2} \| |\mathbf{p}| \psi \|^2.
 \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$(48) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_0^\infty dz \left\| D_\gamma \frac{1}{D_\gamma^2 + z^2} \phi \Lambda_0 \psi \right\|^2 &= \frac{\pi}{4} \left\| |D_\gamma|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \phi \Lambda_0 \psi \right\|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{\pi}{4} \frac{j}{j-1} \left\| |D_0|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \phi \Lambda_0 \psi \right\|^2 \leq \frac{\pi}{4j(j-1)} \|\mathbf{p}\psi\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

where the last line uses Hardy's inequality.

The second summand of (44)

$$(49) \quad \begin{aligned} &|\langle \psi, \frac{\gamma}{\pi} \int_0^\infty dz \frac{1}{D_0^2 + z^2} \frac{z^2}{|\mathbf{x}|} \frac{1}{D_\gamma^2 + z^2} \phi \Lambda_0 \psi \rangle| \\ &\leq \frac{\gamma}{\pi} \left[\int_0^\infty dz \left\| \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x}|} \frac{z}{D_0^2 + z^2} \psi \right\|^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \left[\int_0^\infty dz \left\| \frac{z}{D_\gamma^2 + z^2} \phi \Lambda_0 \psi \right\|^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

The first factor on the right side is estimated similarly as in (47); the second factor is estimated similarly as in (48) with the same results. Putting everything together gives

$$(50) \quad I \leq \frac{\gamma}{2j(j-1)} \|\mathbf{p}\psi\|^2$$

Term *II*: The square root of *II* is

$$(51) \quad \begin{aligned} &|\langle \psi, (\Lambda_\gamma - \Lambda_0) \phi (\Lambda_\gamma - \Lambda_0) \psi \rangle|^{1/2} \leq \frac{1}{j^{\frac{1}{2}}} \left\| |\mathbf{p}|^{\frac{1}{2}} (\Lambda_\gamma - \Lambda_0) \psi \right\| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{j^{\frac{1}{2}}} \sup_{\substack{\|h\|=1 \\ h \in \mathfrak{H}_{j,l}}} |\langle h, \int_0^\infty dz |\mathbf{p}|^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{1}{D_\gamma^2 + z^2} \left(D_\gamma \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x}|} D_0 - \frac{z^2}{|\mathbf{x}|} \right) \frac{1}{D_0^2 + z^2} \psi \rangle|. \end{aligned}$$

using (43) in the last step. The second term of the right side yields

$$(52) \quad \begin{aligned} &|\langle h, \int_0^\infty dz |\mathbf{p}|^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{1}{D_\gamma^2 + z^2} \frac{z^2}{|\mathbf{x}|} \frac{1}{D_0^2 + z^2} \psi \rangle| \\ &\leq \left[\int_0^\infty \left\| \frac{z}{D_\gamma^2 + z^2} |\mathbf{p}|^{\frac{1}{2}} h \right\|^2 dz \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \left[\int_0^\infty \left\| \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x}|} \frac{z}{D_0^2 + z^2} \psi \right\|^2 dz \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2j} \left\| \frac{1}{|D_\gamma|^{\frac{1}{2}}} |\mathbf{p}|^{\frac{1}{2}} h \right\| \left[\int_0^\infty \left\| \mathbf{p} \frac{z}{D_0^2 + z^2} \psi \right\|^2 dz \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \frac{\pi}{4\sqrt{j(j-1)}} \|h\| \left\| \mathbf{p} \frac{1}{|D_0|^{\frac{1}{2}}} \psi \right\| \leq \frac{\pi}{4\sqrt{j(j-1)}} \|\mathbf{p}\psi\|. \end{aligned}$$

The first term can be treated analogously.

Summing *I* and *II* yields the claimed estimate since $j + \frac{1}{2} \geq l \geq j - \frac{1}{2}$ in $\mathfrak{H}_{j,l}$. $\square$

4.2. Estimate on the Projected Dirac-Coulomb Operator. We will need a similar estimate for the expectation value of the Dirac operator D_γ .

Lemma 6. *Assume $\gamma \in [0, 1]$, $j \geq \frac{3}{2}$ and $\psi \in \Pi_{l,j} \Lambda_0 H^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C}^4)$. Then*

$$(53) \quad 0 \leq \langle \psi, \Lambda_\gamma (D_\gamma - 1) \Lambda_\gamma \psi \rangle - \langle \psi, (D_\gamma - 1) \psi \rangle \leq \frac{C}{2l^2} \langle \psi, \mathbf{p}^2 \psi \rangle.$$

Proof. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \psi, \Lambda_\gamma (D_\gamma - 1) \Lambda_\gamma \psi \rangle &= \langle \psi, \Lambda_0 \Lambda_\gamma (D_\gamma - 1) \Lambda_\gamma \Lambda_0 \psi \rangle \\
&= \langle \psi, \Lambda_0 (1 - \Lambda_\gamma^\perp) (D_\gamma - 1) (1 - \Lambda_\gamma^\perp) \Lambda_0 \psi \rangle \\
&= \langle \psi, \Lambda_0 (D_\gamma - 1) \Lambda_0 \psi \rangle - \langle \psi, \Lambda_0 \Lambda_\gamma^\perp (D_\gamma - 1) \Lambda_\gamma^\perp \Lambda_0 \psi \rangle \\
&= \langle \psi, \Lambda_0 (D_\gamma - 1) \Lambda_0 \psi \rangle - \langle \psi, (\Lambda_0 - \Lambda_\gamma) ([D_\gamma]_- - 1) (\Lambda_0 - \Lambda_\gamma) \psi \rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

First of all, we note that

$$(54) \quad [D_\gamma]_- - 1 < 0$$

which allows us to make the crude estimates

$$(55) \quad |[D_\gamma]_- - 1| = -[D_\gamma]_- + 1 \leq |D_\gamma| + 1 \leq (1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\gamma^2}}) |D_\gamma|.$$

Hence,

$$|\langle \psi, (\Lambda_0 - \Lambda_\gamma) ([D_\gamma]_- - 1) (\Lambda_0 - \Lambda_\gamma) \psi \rangle| \leq (1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\gamma^2}}) \| |D_\gamma|^{\frac{1}{2}} (\Lambda_0 - \Lambda_\gamma) \psi \|^2.$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned}
A &:= \| |D_\gamma|^{\frac{1}{2}} (\Lambda_0 - \Lambda_\gamma) \psi \| = \frac{\gamma}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\nu \| |D_\gamma|^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{1}{D_\gamma + i\nu} \frac{1}{|\cdot|} \frac{1}{D_0 + i\nu} \psi \| \\
&\leq \frac{\gamma}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\nu \| |D_\gamma|^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{1}{D_\gamma + i\nu} \| \| \frac{1}{|\cdot|} \frac{1}{D_0 + i\nu} \psi \|
\end{aligned}$$

Since $l \geq 1$, we have $\langle \psi, D_\gamma \psi \rangle \geq 1/\sqrt{2}$ (see (12)) and

$$\frac{|D_\gamma|}{D_\gamma^2 + \nu^2} \leq \frac{\max\{1/\sqrt{2}, |\nu|\}}{\max\{1/2, \nu^2\} + \nu^2}.$$

Using Hardy's inequality we get

$$\begin{aligned}
A &\leq \frac{\gamma}{2\pi j} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\nu \sqrt{\frac{\max\{\sqrt{1/2}, |\nu|\}}{\max\{1/2, \nu^2\} + \nu^2}} \| \mathbf{P} \frac{1}{D_0 + i\nu} \psi \| \\
&\leq \frac{\gamma}{2\pi j} \left(\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\nu \frac{\max(\sqrt{1/2}, |\nu|)}{\max(1/2, \nu^2) + \nu^2} \frac{1}{|\nu|^{\frac{1}{2}}} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\mu |\mu|^{\frac{1}{2}} \| \mathbf{P} \frac{1}{D_0 + i\mu} \psi \|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq \frac{\sqrt[3]{2}\gamma}{2\pi j} \left(\underbrace{\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\nu \frac{\max(1, |\nu|)}{\max(1, \nu^2) + \nu^2} \frac{1}{|\nu|^{\frac{1}{2}}} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\mu |\mu|^{\frac{1}{2}} \| \mathbf{P} \frac{1}{D_0 + i\mu} \psi \|^2}_{\leq 6} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq \frac{\gamma\sqrt{6}}{2\pi j} \left\langle \psi, \mathbf{P} \frac{1}{|D_0|^{\frac{1}{2}}} \mathbf{P} \psi \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \frac{\gamma\sqrt{6}}{2\pi j} \| \mathbf{P} \psi \|.
\end{aligned}$$

□

4.3. Inserting the Trial Density Matrix. To finish the proof of the upper bound we will insert the trial density matrix constructed in Appendix D (in the correct units $V_c^* dV_c$) into the Hartree-Fock functional (without exchange energy)

$$(56) \quad \mathcal{E}_{\text{HF}}(d) := \text{tr} \left[\left(c\boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{p} + c^2\beta - c^2 - \frac{Z}{|\mathbf{x}|} \right) d \right] + D[\rho]$$

where $\rho(\mathbf{x}) := \text{tr}_{\mathbb{C}^4} d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})$. We will need the following auxiliary lemma on the Schrödinger energy.

Lemma 7. For $\gamma := \frac{Z}{c} < 1$

$$(57) \quad E_S(Z) \geq \text{tr}[(\frac{\mathbf{p}^2}{2} - \frac{Z}{|\mathbf{x}|})d_{<}^S] + \text{tr}[(c\boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{p} + c^2\beta - c^2 - \frac{Z}{|\mathbf{x}|})d_{>,\Phi}] + D[\rho_{>,\Phi}] + \mathcal{O}(Z^{\frac{47}{24}})$$

with

$$\rho(\mathbf{x})_{>,\Phi} := \text{tr}_{\mathbb{C}^4}(d_{>,\Phi}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})).$$

Proof. We recall, following [34] and [66, Proposition 4],

$$(58) \quad E_S(Z) = \text{tr}[(\frac{\mathbf{p}^2}{2} - \frac{Z}{|\mathbf{x}|})d^S] + D(\rho^S, \rho^S) + \mathcal{O}(Z^{47/24})$$

where $\rho^S(\mathbf{x}) := \text{tr}_{\mathbb{C}^2}(d^S(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})) = \text{tr}_{\mathbb{C}^2}(d_{<}^S(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})) + \underbrace{\text{tr}_{\mathbb{C}^2}(d_{>}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}))}_{=:\rho_{>}(\mathbf{x})}$. We drop the

Coulomb interaction between orbitals with small angular momenta and the total density, since it is positive. Furthermore, by [35, Lemma 4.7.], it holds

$$(59) \quad D(\rho_{>,\Phi} - \rho_{>}, \rho_{>,\Phi} + \rho_{>}) = \mathcal{O}(Z^{5/3}).$$

Note that in the reference the statement is given in terms of the transformation $U_c(\mathbf{A}) := \Phi_0(\mathbf{p}/c)\mathbf{A}\Phi_0(\mathbf{p}/c) + \Phi_0(\mathbf{p}/c)\mathbf{A}\Phi_0(\mathbf{p}/c)$ and the density

$$(60) \quad \rho_{U,>}(\mathbf{x}) := \text{tr}_{\mathbb{C}^2}(U_c(d_{>})(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})).$$

However,

$$(61) \quad \rho_{U,>} \equiv \rho_{>,\Phi}.$$

Finally, by Frank et al [35, Lemma 4.6.]

$$(62) \quad \text{tr}[\frac{Z}{|\mathbf{x}|}d_{>,\Phi}] - \text{tr}[\frac{Z}{|\mathbf{x}|}d_{>}] = \mathcal{O}(Z^{23/12})$$

and the observation that

$$(63) \quad \text{tr}[(c\boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{p} + c^2\beta - c^2)d_{>,\Phi}] = \text{tr}[(\sqrt{c^2\mathbf{p}^2 + c^4} - c^2)d_{>}] \leq \frac{1}{2}\text{tr}[\mathbf{p}^2d_{>}]$$

we conclude the proof. $\square$

Now, $\mathcal{E}_{\text{HF}}$ yields the following estimate.

Proposition 1. For $\frac{Z}{c} < 1$,

$$(64) \quad E_\gamma(Z) \leq \text{tr}[(c\boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{p} + c^2\beta - c^2 - \frac{Z}{|\mathbf{x}|})\Lambda_{Z,c}d] + D(\rho^F, \rho^F)$$

where

$$(65) \quad \Lambda_{Z,c} := \mathbb{1}_{(0,\infty)}(c\boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{p} + c^2\beta)$$

and

$$(66) \quad \rho^F(\mathbf{x}) := \text{tr}_{\mathbb{C}^4}((\Lambda_{Z,c}d\Lambda_{Z,c})(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})).$$

Combining Lemma 7, Proposition 1 and the positivity of the Coulomb energy we find

$$(67) \quad E_\gamma(Z) - E_S(Z) \leq \text{tr}[(c\boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{p} + c^2\beta - c^2 - \frac{Z}{|\mathbf{x}|})\Lambda_{Z,c}d_{<}] - \text{tr}[(\frac{\mathbf{p}^2}{2} - \frac{Z}{|\mathbf{x}|})d_{<}^S]$$

$$(68) \quad + \underbrace{\text{tr}[(c\boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{p} + c^2\beta - c^2 - \frac{Z}{|\mathbf{x}|})(\Lambda_{Z,c}d_{>,\Phi} - d_{>,\Phi})]}_{R_1}$$

$$(69) \quad + D(\rho^F - \rho_{>,\Phi}, \rho^F + \rho_{>,\Phi}) + \mathcal{O}(Z^{47/24}).$$

Moreover, we write

$$(70) \quad D(\rho^F - \rho_{>,\Phi}, \rho^F + \rho_{>,\Phi}) = \underbrace{D(\rho_{>}^F - \rho_{>,\Phi}, \rho_{>}^F + \rho_{>,\Phi})}_{=:R_2} + \underbrace{D(\rho_{<}^F, \rho^F + \rho_{>}^F)}_{=:R_3}$$

with

$$(71) \quad \rho_{<}^F(\mathbf{x}) := \text{tr}_{\mathbb{C}^4}((\Lambda_{Z,c} d_{<} \Lambda_{Z,c})(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})) = \text{tr}_{\mathbb{C}^4}(d_{<}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}))$$

and

$$(72) \quad \rho_{>}^F(\mathbf{x}) := \text{tr}_{\mathbb{C}^4}((\Lambda_{Z,c} d_{>,\Phi} \Lambda_{Z,c})(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})).$$

We will see that the first term on the right side of Inequality (67) yields the Scott correction. In the following we will prove that the error terms R_1, R_2 , and R_3 are negligible.

Lemma 8. *As $Z \rightarrow \infty$*

$$(73) \quad R_1 = \text{tr}[(c\boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{p} + c^2\beta - c^2 - \frac{Z}{|\mathbf{x}|})(\Lambda_{Z,c} d_{>,\Phi} - d_{>,\Phi})] = \mathcal{O}(Z^{23/12})$$

uniformly in $\gamma \in [0, 1]$

Proof. By Lemmata 5 and 6 and the scaling behavior of the map V_c we have

$$(74) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \text{tr}[(c\boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{p} + c^2\beta - c^2 - \frac{Z}{|\mathbf{x}|})\Lambda_{Z,c} d_{>,\Phi}] - \text{tr}[(c\boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{p} + c^2\beta - c^2 - \frac{Z}{|\mathbf{x}|})d_{>,\Phi}] \\ &\leq \sum_l \frac{C}{l^2} \text{tr}_l[\mathbf{p}^2 d_{>,\Phi}] = \sum_l \frac{C}{l^2} \text{tr}_l[\mathbf{p}^2 d_{>}] \end{aligned}$$

The result follows from Lemma 12. $\square$

Likewise we can show that R_2 is negligible.

Lemma 9. *As $Z \rightarrow \infty$*

$$(75) \quad D(\rho_{>}^F - \rho_{>,\Phi}, \rho_{>}^F + \rho_{>,\Phi}) = \mathcal{O}(Z^{23/12}).$$

uniformly in $\gamma \in [0, 1]$.

Proof. By Newton's theorem and, in the last step, Lemma 5 and scaling,

$$(76) \quad \begin{aligned} D(\rho_{>}^F - \rho_{>,\Phi}, \rho_{>}^F + \rho_{>,\Phi}) &\leq \frac{1}{2} \int (\rho_{>}^F(\mathbf{x}) + \rho_{>,\Phi}(\mathbf{x})) d\mathbf{x} \int \frac{\rho_{>}^F(\mathbf{x}) - \rho_{>,\Phi}(\mathbf{x})}{|\mathbf{x}|} d\mathbf{x} \\ &\leq Z \text{tr}[\frac{1}{|\mathbf{x}|}(\Lambda_{Z,c} d_{>,\Phi} \Lambda_{Z,c} - d_{>,\Phi})] \leq \sum_l \frac{C}{l^2} \text{tr}_l[\mathbf{p}^2 d_{>}]. \end{aligned}$$

The lemma follows again from Lemma 12. $\square$

It remains the error estimate for R_3 .

Lemma 10. *As $Z \rightarrow \infty$*

$$(77) \quad D(\rho_{<}^F, \rho^F + \rho_{>}^F) = \mathcal{O}(Z^{11/6})$$

uniformly in $\gamma \in [0, 1]$.

Proof. Again, by Newton's theorem,

$$(78) \quad D(\rho_{<}^F, \rho^F + \rho_{>}^F) \leq \frac{1}{2} \int (\rho^F(\mathbf{x}) + \rho_{>}^F(\mathbf{x})) d\mathbf{x} \int \frac{\rho_{<}^F(\mathbf{x})}{|\mathbf{x}|} d\mathbf{x} \leq Z \int \frac{\rho_{<}^F(\mathbf{x})}{|\mathbf{x}|} d\mathbf{x}.$$

The Coulomb energy of the electrons with low angular momenta can be estimated with help of Lemma 2 and scaling

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int \frac{\rho_{<}^F(\mathbf{x})}{|\mathbf{x}|} d\mathbf{x} = \text{tr} \left[\frac{1}{|\mathbf{x}|} d_{<} \right] = \sum_{l=0}^{L-1} \sum_{j \geq \frac{1}{2}, j=l \pm \frac{1}{2}} \sum_{m=-j}^j \sum_{n=1}^{K-l} \langle \psi_{j,l,m,n}, \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x}|} \psi_{j,l,m,n} \rangle \\
(79) \quad & \leq \sum_{l=0}^{L-1} \sum_{j \geq \frac{1}{2}, j=l \pm \frac{1}{2}} \sum_{m=-j}^j \sum_{n=1}^{K-l} \frac{CZ}{(n+l)^2} \\
& \leq \frac{C}{Z} \sum_{l=0}^{L-1} (2l+1) \sum_{n=1}^{K-l} \frac{1}{(n+l)^2} \leq CL^2 K^{-1} Z = \mathcal{O}(Z^{5/6}).
\end{aligned}$$

□

5. FINISHING THE PROOF

In the previous section we proved

$$\begin{aligned}
(80) \quad & E_\gamma(Z) - E_S(Z) \\
& \leq \text{tr} \left[(c\boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{p} + c^2\beta - c^2 - \frac{Z}{|\mathbf{x}|}) \Lambda_{Z,c} d_{<} \right] - \text{tr} \left[\left(\frac{\mathbf{p}^2}{2} - \frac{Z}{|\mathbf{x}|} \right) d_{<}^S \right] + \mathcal{O}(Z^{47/24}).
\end{aligned}$$

Upon scaling with the map $V_{c^{-1}}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(81) \quad & \text{tr} \left[(c\boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{p} + c^2\beta - c^2 - \frac{Z}{|\mathbf{x}|}) \Lambda_{Z,c} d_{<} \right] - \text{tr} \left[\left(\frac{\mathbf{p}^2}{2} - \frac{Z}{|\mathbf{x}|} \right) d_{<}^S \right] \\
& = \frac{Z^2}{\gamma^2} \sum_{l=0}^{L-1} \sum_{j \geq \frac{1}{2}, j=l \pm \frac{1}{2}} (2j+1) \sum_{n=1}^{K-l} (\lambda_{\gamma,n,l,j}^D - \lambda_{\gamma,n,l}^S) = Z^2 s^D(\gamma) + R_4 + R_5
\end{aligned}$$

with $s^D(\gamma)$ defined in (9) and

$$(82) \quad R_4 := Z^2 \gamma^{-2} \sum_{l=0}^{L-1} \sum_{j \geq \frac{1}{2}, j=l \pm \frac{1}{2}} (2j+1) \sum_{n=K-l+1}^{\infty} (\lambda_{\gamma,n,l}^S - \lambda_{\gamma,n,l,j}^D)$$

and

$$(83) \quad R_5 := Z^2 \gamma^{-2} \sum_{l=L}^{\infty} \sum_{j \geq \frac{1}{2}, j=l \pm \frac{1}{2}} (2j+1) \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (\lambda_{\gamma,n,l}^S - \lambda_{\gamma,n,l,j}^D).$$

By Corollary 1, for every $\gamma \in [0, 1)$ there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
(84) \quad & R_4 \leq CZ^2 \gamma^{-2} \sum_{l=0}^{L-1} \sum_{j \geq \frac{1}{2}, j=l \pm \frac{1}{2}} (2j+1) \sum_{n=K-l+1}^{\infty} \frac{\gamma^4}{(n+l)^3 l} \\
& \leq C\gamma^2 Z^2 \sum_{l=0}^{L-1} \sum_{n=K-l+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(n+l)^3} \leq C\gamma^2 Z^2 LK^{-2} = \mathcal{O}(Z^{17/12}).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
(85) \quad & R_5 \leq CZ^2 \gamma^{-2} \sum_{l=L}^{\infty} \sum_{j \geq \frac{1}{2}, j=l \pm \frac{1}{2}} (2j+1) \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\gamma^4}{(n+l)^3 l} \leq C\gamma^2 Z^2 \sum_{l=L}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(n+l)^3} \\
& \leq C\gamma^2 Z^2 \sum_{l=L}^{\infty} \frac{1}{l^2} \leq C\gamma^2 Z^2 L^{-1} = \mathcal{O}(Z^{23/12}).
\end{aligned}$$

6. COMPARISON WITH (SEMI-)EMPIRICAL DATA AND SCHWINGER'S PREDICTION

As described in the introduction, quantum electrodynamics is believed to describe particles interacting through electromagnetic forces, including heavy atoms. Unfortunately, the numerical evaluation of such systems seems to be beyond present techniques, not to mention the principal problem that QED is only perturbatively defined rendering the treatment of heavy neutral atoms difficult.

In view of this fact, the comparison with experimental values appears to be the only source of validation of the results. This, however, is not directly possible, since our asymptotic result requires to fix αZ . Experimentally, though, α_{physical} is a fixed constant of value roughly $1/137$, whereas Z takes integer values up to 120.

Moreover, the published atomic ground state energies $E_{\text{NIST}}(Z)$ in the NIST Atomic Spectra Data Base [44] are measured only to a small extent. The majority of the energies for large Z is extrapolated or computed, i.e., assumptions on underlying approximate mathematically uncontrolled models influence those data. In addition the experimental values obviously also contain other QED effects not contained in the Furry Hamiltonian defined through (3).

Thus it is not obvious that our formula for the ground state energy with γ replaced by $\alpha_{\text{physical}}Z$ should give an improved quantitative description of large atoms. Nevertheless, emboldened by Sell's [73] *principle of unreasonable utility of asymptotic expansions* and its history of successful application, e.g., Lebowitz and Waisman [45] and Schwinger [62], we offer a graphical comparison of

$$\frac{E_{\text{NIST}}(Z) - E_{\text{TF}}(Z)}{Z^2}$$

with the relativistic Scott function

$$\frac{1}{2} - s^D(\alpha_{\text{physical}}Z)$$

in Figure 1. Additionally we show the Dirac-Hartree-Fock calculations carried out by Desclaux [11]. Note that the Scott function is not divergent for $Z \rightarrow \frac{1}{\alpha_{\text{physical}}}$ (as was claimed in [56]), but instead approaches the numerical value

$$(86) \quad \lim_{\gamma \rightarrow 1} \left(\frac{1}{2} - s^D(\gamma) \right) \approx -1.91.$$

Unlike the Chandrasekhar model [49] and the Brown-Ravenhall model [20, 35] which give substantially too low energies and break down for $\gamma = 2/\pi < 1$ and $\gamma = 2/(\pi/2 + 2/\pi)$ respectively, the Furry picture – which for numerical purposes is implemented through the Douglas-Kroll-Hess transform – does not only give stable ground state energies and good numerical values in quantum chemistry (see [58] for an extensive overview), but, as Figure 1 shows, it also offers a step toward a quantitative correct description of heavy atoms.

We will supplement the data with Schwinger's prediction [62] of the relativistic Scott correction which was derived from the γ^4 fine structure correction to the non-relativistic eigenvalues implied by the Dirac equation, i.e., the second term of the perturbative expansion of the kinetic energy

$$\langle \psi, -\frac{\mathbf{p}^4}{8} \psi \rangle,$$

the spin-orbit coupling

$$\langle \psi, \frac{\gamma}{2} \mathbf{S} \cdot \mathbf{L} \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x}|^3} \psi \rangle,$$

and the Darwin term

$$\langle \psi, \frac{\pi}{2} \gamma \delta(\mathbf{x}) \psi \rangle.$$




FIGURE 1. Comparison of the relativistic Scott function with data taken from the NIST database [44], Dirac-Fock calculations [11] and Schwinger's original prediction [62].

Together they yield

$$\delta\lambda_{n,l,j} = \frac{\gamma^4}{-2(n+l)^3} \left(\frac{1}{j + \frac{1}{2}} - \frac{3}{4} \frac{1}{n+l} \right)$$

(cf. (14)). Following Schwinger's computations and using the identity

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(m+n)^s} = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^m \frac{1}{m^s} = \zeta(s-1) - \zeta(s),$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} s_{Schwinger}^D &:= \frac{1}{\gamma^2} \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j \geq \frac{1}{2}, j=l \pm \frac{1}{2}} (2j+1) \delta\lambda_{n,l,j} \\ &= - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\gamma^2}{n^3} \left(1 - \frac{3}{4n}\right) - \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\gamma^2}{(n+l)^3} \left(2 - \frac{3}{4}\right) \frac{2l+1}{n+l} \\ (87) \quad &= -\zeta(3)\gamma^2 + \frac{3}{4}\zeta(4)\gamma^2 - \frac{5}{4} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\gamma^2}{(n+l)^3} + \frac{3}{4} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\gamma^2}{(n+l)^4} \\ &= (-\zeta(3) + \frac{3}{4}\zeta(4) - \frac{5}{4}\zeta(2) + \frac{5}{4}\zeta(3) + \frac{3}{4}\zeta(3) - \frac{3}{4}\zeta(4))\gamma^2 \\ &= \left(\frac{5\pi^2}{24} - \zeta(3)\right)\gamma^2 \sim -0.854\gamma^2 \end{aligned}$$

which is asymptotically correct in the non-relativistic limit $\gamma \rightarrow 0$.

APPENDIX A. THOMAS-FERMI THEORY

We collect some well known auxiliary facts of the Thomas-Fermi density. For a more exhaustive overview see Lieb and Simon [48] and Lieb [47]. Consider the minimizer ρ_Z^{TF} of the Thomas-Fermi functional

$$(88) \quad \mathcal{E}^{\text{TF}}[\rho] = \frac{3}{5} \frac{(3\pi^2)^{\frac{2}{3}}}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \rho(x)^{\frac{5}{3}} dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{Z\rho(x)}{|x|} dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{\rho(x)\rho(y)}{|x-y|} dx dy$$

in the set $\mathcal{I} := \{\rho \in L^{\frac{5}{3}} | \rho \geq 0, D[\rho] < \infty\}$. The infimum

$$E_{\text{TF}}(Z) := \inf \mathcal{E}^{\text{TF}}(\mathcal{I})$$

is attained and $\int \rho = Z$. Moreover

$$(89) \quad E_{\text{TF}}(Z) = E_{\text{TF}}(1)Z^{7/3}.$$

The Thomas-Fermi energy of hydrogen has been calculated first by Milne [53] and later by Sommerfeld [72] reducing it to the slope of the Thomas-Fermi potential at zero, i.e., Baker's constant and has the value

$$(90) \quad E_{\text{TF}}(1) \sim -0.768745[Hu].$$

Lemma 11 (Properties of the Thomas-Fermi density). *The Thomas-Fermi density ρ_Z^{TF} and its mean-field potential $V_Z := \rho_Z^{\text{TF}} * \frac{1}{|\cdot|}$ satisfy*

- (1) $\|V_Z\|_{\infty} \leq CZ^{\frac{4}{3}}$ for some constant $C > 0$,
- (2) $|\mathbf{p}V_Z| \leq \frac{CZ^{\frac{3}{2}}}{|\mathbf{x}|^{\frac{1}{2}}}$,
- (3) $|\mathbf{p}^2V_Z| = |\rho_Z^{\text{TF}}| \leq \frac{CZ^{\frac{3}{2}}}{|\mathbf{x}|^{\frac{3}{2}}}$.

This is easily verified by using the scaling relation of the Thomas-Fermi density $\rho_Z^{\text{TF}}(\mathbf{x}) = Z^2 \rho_1^{\text{TF}}(Z^{\frac{1}{3}}\mathbf{x})$ and the Thomas-Fermi equation

$$(91) \quad \frac{1}{2}(3\pi^2)^{\frac{2}{3}}(\rho_Z^{\text{TF}})^{\frac{2}{3}} = \frac{Z}{|\cdot|} - V_Z.$$

APPENDIX B. PARTIAL WAVE ANALYSIS

For the convenience of the reader and for normalization of the notation we gather some fact on the partial wave analysis of the Brown-Ravenhall operator (see, e.g., [35]).

We denote by $Y_{l,m}$ the normalized spherical harmonics on the unit sphere $\mathbb{S}^2$ (see, e.g., [52], p. 421) with the convention that $Y_{l,m} \equiv 0$ if $|m| > l$, and we define for $j \in \mathbb{N}_0 + \frac{1}{2}$, $l \in \mathbb{N}_0$, and $m = -j, \dots, j$ the spherical spinors

$$(92) \quad \Omega_{j,l,m}(\omega) := \begin{cases} \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\frac{j+m}{2j}} Y_{l,m-\frac{1}{2}}(\omega) \\ \sqrt{\frac{j-m}{2j}} Y_{l,m+\frac{1}{2}}(\omega) \end{pmatrix} & \text{if } j = l + \frac{1}{2}, \\ \begin{pmatrix} -\sqrt{\frac{j-m+1}{2j+2}} Y_{l,m-\frac{1}{2}}(\omega) \\ \sqrt{\frac{j+m+1}{2j+2}} Y_{l,m+\frac{1}{2}}(\omega) \end{pmatrix} & \text{if } j = l - \frac{1}{2}. \end{cases}$$

The set of admissible indices is $\mathcal{I} := \{(j, l, m) | j \in \mathbb{N} - 1/2, l = j \pm 1/2, m = -j, \dots, j\}$. It is known that the functions $\Omega_{j,l,m}$, $(j, l, m) \in \mathcal{I}$, form an orthonormal basis of the Hilbert space $L^2(\mathbb{S}^2; \mathbb{C}^2)$. They are joint eigenfunctions of $\mathbf{J}^2$, $\mathbf{L}^2$, and J_3 with eigenvalues given by $j(j+1)$, $l(l+1)$, and m . The subspace $\mathfrak{h}_{j,l,m}$ corresponding to the joint eigenspace of total angular momentum $\mathbf{J}^2$ with eigenvalue $j(j+1)$ and angular momentum $\mathbf{L}^2$ with eigenvalue $l(l+1)$ is given by

$$\mathfrak{h}_{j,l,m} = \text{span}\{\mathbf{x} \mapsto |\mathbf{x}|^{-1} f(|\mathbf{x}|) \Omega_{j,l,m}(\omega_{\mathbf{x}}) \mid f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}_+)\}$$

where $\omega_{\mathbf{x}} := \mathbf{x}/|\mathbf{x}|$. This leads to the orthogonal decomposition

$$(93) \quad \mathfrak{h} = \bigoplus_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0 + \frac{1}{2}} \bigoplus_{l=j \pm 1/2} \mathfrak{h}_{j,l}, \quad \mathfrak{h}_{j,l} = \bigoplus_{m=-j}^j \mathfrak{h}_{j,l,m},$$

of the Hilbert space of two spinors.

Note the identity (see, e.g., Greiner [38])

$$(94) \quad (\boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \boldsymbol{\omega}_{\mathbf{x}}) \Omega_{j,l,m}(\boldsymbol{\omega}_{\mathbf{x}}) = -\Omega_{j,2j-l,m}(\boldsymbol{\omega}_{\mathbf{x}}).$$

Furthermore for fixed l

$$(95) \quad \dim_l(\{\Omega_{j,l,m}, (j, l, m) \in \mathfrak{J}\}) = 2(2l + 1).$$

In $\mathfrak{H} = L^2(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C}^4)$ the corresponding decomposition is obtained from the discussion above by noting that in $L^2(\mathbb{S}^2; \mathbb{C}^4)$ eigenfunctions corresponding to the operators $\mathbf{J}^2, J_z$ (now acting on 4-spinors) can be constructed as linear combinations of the 2-spinor eigenfunctions

$$(96) \quad \begin{aligned} \Phi_{j,l,m}^+ &= \begin{pmatrix} i\Omega_{j,l,m} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ \Phi_{j,l,m}^- &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ -\Omega_{j,2j-l,m} \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

i.e.,

$$(97) \quad \mathfrak{H} = \bigoplus_{j,l} \mathfrak{H}_{j,l} := \bigoplus_{(j,l,m) \in \mathfrak{J}} \mathfrak{H}_{j,l,m}$$

where

$$(98) \quad \mathfrak{H}_{j,l,m} = \{\mathbf{x} \rightarrow \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x}|} f(|\mathbf{x}|) \Phi_{j,l,m}^+(\omega_x) + \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x}|} g(|\mathbf{x}|) \Phi_{j,l,m}^-(\omega_x); f, g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}_+)\}.$$

The orthogonal projections onto those spaces are denoted by $\Pi_{j,l}$ and $\Pi_{j,l,m}$.

While the Dirac operator is not commuting with the orbital angular momentum $\mathbf{L}$, these subspaces of $\mathfrak{H}$ are still left invariant since

$$(99) \quad \begin{aligned} i(\boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \boldsymbol{\omega}_{\mathbf{x}}) \Phi_{j,l,m}^+(\boldsymbol{\omega}_{\mathbf{x}}) &= -\Phi_{j,l,m}^-(\boldsymbol{\omega}_{\mathbf{x}}) \\ i(\boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \boldsymbol{\omega}_{\mathbf{x}}) \Phi_{j,l,m}^-(\boldsymbol{\omega}_{\mathbf{x}}) &= +\Phi_{j,l,m}^+(\boldsymbol{\omega}_{\mathbf{x}}) \end{aligned}$$

(Balinsky and Evans [2, p. 32, 2.1.30]).

APPENDIX C. THE FOLDY-WOUTHUYSEN TRANSFORMATION

The free Dirac operator my defined using two unitary transforms, the Fourier transform and the Foldy-Wouthuysen transform [32]

$$(100) \quad u(\mathbf{p}) = a_+(p) \mathbf{1} + a_-(p) \beta \boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \boldsymbol{\omega}$$

using $p = |\mathbf{p}|$, $\boldsymbol{\omega} = \frac{\mathbf{p}}{p}$, $a_{\pm} = \sqrt{\frac{E(p) \pm 1}{2E(p)}}$, $E(p) = \sqrt{p^2 + 1}$, through the following formula

$$(101) \quad \begin{aligned} D_0 &:= \mathcal{F}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & c\boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{p} \\ c\boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{p} & -1 \end{pmatrix} \mathcal{F} \\ &= \mathcal{F}^{-1} u(\mathbf{p}/c)^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} E(p/c) & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & E(p/c) & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -E(p/c) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -E(p/c) \end{pmatrix} u(\mathbf{p}/c) \mathcal{F}. \end{aligned}$$

Since the diagonal operator is self-adjoint with domain $L^2(\mathbb{R} : \mathbb{C}^4, (1 + \mathbf{p}^2) d\mathbf{p})$, D_0 , the free Dirac operator is self-adjoint on $H^1(\mathbb{R}^3, d\mathbf{p})$.

For the Brown-Ravenhall operator this gives rise to the isometry

$$(102) \quad \begin{aligned} \Phi_c : \mathfrak{h} &:= L^2(\mathbb{R}^3 : \mathbb{C}^2) \mapsto \mathfrak{h}^B \\ \psi &\mapsto (\Phi_0 \psi, \Phi_1 \psi) \end{aligned}$$

where in Fourier representation $\Phi_0(\mathbf{p}) = \sqrt{\frac{E(p)+1}{2E(p)}}$, $\Phi_1(\mathbf{p}) = \sqrt{\frac{E(p)-1}{2E(p)}} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \boldsymbol{\omega}$. In particular, the isometric property is easy to see since the map

$$(103) \quad \mathbf{a} \mapsto (\Phi_0(\mathbf{p})\mathbf{a}, \Phi_1(\mathbf{p})\mathbf{a})$$

for $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{C}^2$ is an isometry from $\mathbb{C}^2$ to $\mathbb{C}^4$ independent of $\mathbf{p}$.

APPENDIX D. THE TRIAL DENSITY MATRIX

In this section we will define the density matrix d which will be used to bound the Furry energy from above via the usual min-max principle. The construction will be in the spirit of [69, 66], in particular the density matrix will be split into two parts, corresponding to low and high angular momenta respectively, i.e.,

$$(104) \quad d := d_{<} + d_{>,\phi} = d_{<} + \boldsymbol{\Phi}_c d_{>} \boldsymbol{\Phi}_c^*$$

acting on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3 : \mathbb{C}^4)$ and its non-relativistic version

$$(105) \quad d^S := d_{<}^S + d_{>}^S$$

which is acting on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3 : \mathbb{C}^2)$. Low angular momenta correspond to orbits with perihelions close to the nucleus, while high angular momenta prohibit orbits in the near vicinity of the nucleus. The separation will be set at $L := \lceil Z^{\frac{1}{12}} \rceil$.

Note that for the construction of the relativistic trial density matrix we lift the high angular momentum part of the non-relativistic density matrix from 2-spinor to 4-spinor space via the Foldy Wouthuysen transformation (cf. appendix C). Consequently d neither belongs to the positive spectral subspaces of the hydrogenic nor the free Dirac operator. However, by construction, the individual parts $d_{<}$ and $d_{>,\phi}$ do.

D.1. Low Angular Momenta. Close to the nucleus the electron-electron interaction will be dominated by the nuclear interaction. This is reflected by choosing the unmodified eigenfunctions of the Coulomb-Dirac operators for small angular momenta,

$$(106) \quad d_{<} := \sum_{l=0}^{L-1} d_{<,l}, \quad d_{<,l} = \sum_{j \geq \frac{1}{2}, j=l \pm \frac{1}{2}} d_{<,j,l}$$

where

$$(107) \quad d_{<,j,l} = \sum_{m=-j}^j \sum_{n=1}^{K-l} |\psi_{j,l,m,n}\rangle \langle \psi_{j,l,m,n}|$$

with $K = \lceil CZ^{\frac{1}{3}} \rceil$ and $\psi_{j,l,m,n}$ being eigenfunctions of the Coulomb-Dirac operator $c\boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{p} + c^2\beta - c^2 - \frac{Z}{|\mathbf{x}|}$ corresponding to eigenvalue $c^2\lambda_{Z,n,l,j}^D$ (cf. (12)) and azimuthal quantum number m . The cutoff K was set on the order of the last occupied shell of the Bohr atom. The Dirac eigenfunctions can be computed explicitly and can be found for instance in [77]. Likewise, we define the non-relativistic analogue

$$(108) \quad d_{<}^S := \sum_{l=0}^{L-1} d_{<,l}^S, \quad d_{<,l}^S = \sum_{j \geq \frac{1}{2}, j=l \pm \frac{1}{2}} d_{<,j,l}^S$$

with

$$(109) \quad d_{<,j,l}^S = \sum_{m=-j}^j \sum_{n=1}^{K-l} |\psi_{j,l,m,n}^S\rangle \langle \psi_{j,l,m,n}^S|$$

where $\psi_{j,l,m,n}^S$ denote the eigenfunctions of $\frac{\mathbf{p}^2}{2} - \frac{Z}{|\mathbf{x}|}$ on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C}^2)$ with eigenvalues $\lambda_{Z,n,l}^S$ (see (12)).

D.2. High Angular Momenta. For large angular momenta, the electrons are moving slowly at far distance from the nucleus. Moreover, the correspondence principle demands a quasi-classical behavior for large quantum numbers. These heuristics suggest that for large angular momenta a semi-classical and non-relativistic description of the electrons in their mean field (if assumed interacting) and a description by the unscreened electrons for small angular momenta suffices to obtain not only the leading contribution to the ground state energy (Thomas-Fermi) but also its first correction (Scott), if the cut between the large and high angular momenta is chosen appropriately. This idea originates in [69] and was guiding the construction of trial density matrices in [66, 33, 34]. We will follow it also here. Of course, the same heuristics additionally suggests that the difference between the Furry and Brown-Ravenhall projections will be small for large angular momenta. That this is indeed the case is the essential technical contribution of this paper which allows to treat the Furry picture. We thus choose

$$(110) \quad d_{>} := \sum_{l \geq L} d_l, \quad d_l := \sum_{j=l \pm \frac{1}{2}} \sum_{m=-j}^{m=j} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} w_{n,l} |\phi_{n,l} \Omega_{j,l,m}\rangle \langle \phi_{n,l} \Omega_{j,l,m}|.$$

The $\phi_{n,l}$ are the Macke orbitals as constructed in [66].

The kinetic energy estimate for the density matrix $d_{>}$ found in [35] will be useful:

Lemma 12 ([35], Lemma E.1). *Let $L = \lceil Z^{1/12} \rceil$. Then for large Z ,*

$$(111) \quad \sum_{l=L}^{\infty} l^{-2} \text{tr}(\mathbf{p}^2 \Phi_c d_{>} \Phi_c^*) = \sum_{l=L}^{\infty} l^{-2} \text{tr}(\mathbf{p}^2 d_l) = \mathcal{O}(Z^2/L).$$

ACKNOWLEDGMENT: It is a pleasure to acknowledge partial support of the Institut Henri Poincaré through its program “Variational and Spectral Methods in Quantum Mechanics” and the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft through its TR-SFB 12 (Symmetrien und Universalität in Mesoskopischen Systemen).

REFERENCES

- [1] Volker Bach. A proof of Scott’s conjecture for ions. *Rep. Math. Phys.*, 28(2):213–248, October 1989.
- [2] A. A. Balinsky and W. D. Evans. *Spectral Analysis of Relativistic Operators*. Imperial College Press, 1 edition, 2011.
- [3] Johann Jakob Balmer. Notiz über die Spectrallinien des Wasserstoffs. *Annalen der Physik*, 261(5):80–87, 1885.
- [4] Pedro Balodis. A proof of Scott’s correction for matter. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 249(1):79–132, 2004.
- [5] Myron Bander. Corrections to the Thomas-Fermi model of the atom. *Annals of Physics*, 144:1–14, 1982.
- [6] H. Bethe. Quantenmechanik der Ein- und Zwei-Elektronenatome. In H. Geiger and K. Scheel, editors, *Handbuch der Physik, XXIV.1, Buch 2*, chapter 3, pages 273–560. Springer, Berlin, 2 edition, 1933.
- [7] G. E. Brown and D. G. Ravenhall. On the interaction of two electrons. *Proc. Roy. Soc. London Ser. A.*, 208:552–559, 1951.
- [8] V M Burke and I P Grant. The effect of relativity on atomic wave functions. *Proceedings of the Physical Society*, 90(2):297, 1967.
- [9] Roch Cassanas and Heinz Siedentop. The ground-state energy of heavy atoms according to Brown and Ravenhall: Absence of relativistic effects in leading order. *J. Phys. A*, 39(33):10405–10414, 2006.
- [10] Charles G. Darwin. The wave equation of the electron. *Proc. Roy. Soc. (London)*, A118:654–680, 1928.
- [11] J.P. Desclaux. Relativistic Dirac-Fock Expectation Values for Atoms with $Z = 1$ to $Z = 120$. *Atomic Data and Nuclear Data Tables*, 12(4):311–406, 1973.
- [12] Paul A. M. Dirac. Note on exchange phenomena in the Thomas-Fermi atom. *Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, 26:376–385, 1931.

- [13] Berthold-Georg Englert and Julian Schwinger. Statistical atom: Handling the strongly bound electrons. *Phys. Rev. A*, 29(5):2331–2338, 1984.
- [14] Berthold-Georg Englert and Julian Schwinger. Statistical atom: Some quantum improvements. *Phys. Rev. A*, 29(5):2339–2352, 1984.
- [15] Berthold-Georg Englert and Julian Schwinger. Atomic-binding-energy oscillations. *Phys. Rev. A*, 32:47–63, 1985.
- [16] László Erdős, Søren Fournais, and Jan Philip Solovej. Relativistic Scott correction in self-generated magnetic fields. *J. Math. Phys.*, 53(9):095202, 26, 2012.
- [17] László Erdős, Søren Fournais, and Jan Philip Solovej. Scott correction for large atoms and molecules in a self-generated magnetic field. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 312(3):847–882, 2012.
- [18] László Erdős, Søren Fournais, and Jan Philip Solovej. Second order semiclassics with self-generated magnetic fields. *Ann. Henri Poincaré*, 13(4):671–730, 2012.
- [19] László Erdős and Jan Philip Solovej. Ground state energy of large atoms in a self-generated magnetic field. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 294(1):229–249, 2010.
- [20] William Desmond Evans, Peter Perry, and Heinz Siedentop. The spectrum of relativistic one-electron atoms according to Bethe and Salpeter. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 178(3):733–746, July 1996.
- [21] C. Fefferman and L. Seco. Eigenfunctions and eigenvalues of ordinary differential operators. *Adv. Math.*, 95(2):145–305, October 1992.
- [22] C. Fefferman and L. Seco. The density of a one-dimensional potential. *Adv. Math.*, 107(2):187–364, September 1994.
- [23] C. Fefferman and L. Seco. The eigenvalue sum of a one-dimensional potential. *Adv. Math.*, 108(2):263–335, October 1994.
- [24] C. Fefferman and L. Seco. On the Dirac and Schwinger corrections to the ground-state energy of an atom. *Adv. Math.*, 107(1):1–188, August 1994.
- [25] C. Fefferman and L. Seco. The density in a three-dimensional radial potential. *Adv. Math.*, 111(1):88–161, March 1995.
- [26] C. L. Fefferman and L. A. Seco. An upper bound for the number of electrons in a large ion. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA*, 86:3464–3465, 1989.
- [27] C. L. Fefferman and L. A. Seco. On the energy of a large atom. *Bull. AMS*, 23(2):525–530, October 1990.
- [28] Charles L. Fefferman and Luis A. Seco. Aperiodicity of the Hamiltonian flow in the Thomas-Fermi potential. *Revista Matemática Iberoamericana*, 9(3):409–551, 1993.
- [29] E. Fermi. Un metodo statistico per la determinazione di alcune proprietà dell’atomo. *Atti della Reale Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Rendiconti, Classe di Scienze Fisiche, Matematiche e Naturali*, 6(12):602–607, 1927.
- [30] E. Fermi. Eine statistische Methode zur Bestimmung einiger Eigenschaften des Atoms und ihre Anwendung auf die Theorie des periodischen Systems der Elemente. *Z. Phys.*, 48:73–79, 1928.
- [31] L. L. Foldy. A note on atomic binding energies. *Phys. Rev.*, 83:397–399, Jul 1951.
- [32] Leslie L. Foldy and Siegfried A. Wouthuysen. On the Dirac Theory of Spin 1/2 Particles and its Non-Relativistic Limit. *Phys. Rev., II. Ser.*, 78:29–36, 1950.
- [33] Rupert L. Frank, Elliott H. Lieb, and Robert Seiringer. Stability of relativistic matter with magnetic fields for nuclear charges up to the critical value. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 275(2):479–489, 2007.
- [34] Rupert L. Frank, Heinz Siedentop, and Simone Warzel. The ground state energy of heavy atoms: Relativistic lowering of the leading energy correction. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 278(2):549–566, 2008.
- [35] Rupert L. Frank, Heinz Siedentop, and Simone Warzel. The energy of heavy atoms according to Brown and Ravenhall: The Scott correction. *Doc. Math.*, 14:463–516, 2009.
- [36] W.H. Furry and J.R. Oppenheimer. On the Theory of the Electron and Positive. *Phys. Rev., II. Ser.*, 45:245–262, 1934.
- [37] Walter Gordon. Die Energieniveaus des Wasserstoffatoms nach der Diracschen Quantentheorie. *Z. Phys.*, 48:11–14, 1928.
- [38] Walter Greiner. *Relativistic Quantum Mechanics*, volume 3 of *Theoretical Physics – Text and Exercise Books*. Springer, Berlin, 1 edition, 1990.
- [39] Marcel Griesemer, Roger T. Lewis, and Heinz Siedentop. A minimax principle for eigenvalues in spectral gaps: Dirac operators with Coulomb potential. *Doc. Math.*, 4:275–283, 1999.
- [40] B. A. Hess. Relativistic electronic structure calculations employing a two-component no-pair formalism with external field projection operators. *Phys. Rev. A*, 33:3742–3748, 1986.
- [41] Webster Hughes. *An Atomic Energy Lower Bound that Gives Scott’s Correction*. PhD thesis, Princeton, Department of Mathematics, 1986.

- [42] Webster Hughes. An atomic lower bound that agrees with Scott's correction. *Adv. in Math.*, 79:213–270, 1990.
- [43] V. Ja. Ivrii and I. M. Sigal. Asymptotics of the ground state energies of large Coulomb systems. *Annals of Math.*, 138(2):243–335, 1993.
- [44] A. Kramida, Yu. Ralchenko, J. Reader, and and NIST ASD Team. NIST Atomic Spectra Database (ver. 5.2), [Online]. Available: <http://physics.nist.gov/asd> [2014, November 6]. National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, MD., 2014.
- [45] Joel L Lebowitz and Eduardo M Waisman. Statistical mechanics of simple fluids: Beyond van der Waals. *Physics Today*, 33(3):24–30, 1980.
- [46] W. Lenz. Über die Anwendbarkeit der statistischen Methode auf Ionengitter. *Z. Phys.*, 77:713–721, 1932.
- [47] Elliott H. Lieb. Thomas-Fermi and related theories of atoms and molecules. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 53(4):603–641, October 1981.
- [48] Elliott H. Lieb and Barry Simon. The Thomas-Fermi theory of atoms, molecules and solids. *Advances in Math.*, 23(1):22–116, 1977.
- [49] Elliott H. Lieb and Horng-Tzer Yau. The stability and instability of relativistic matter. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 118:177–213, 1988.
- [50] Paul Mancas, A. M. Klaus Müller, and Heinz Siedentop. The optimal size of the exchange hole and reduction to one-particle Hamiltonians. *Theoretical Chemistry Accounts: Theory, Computation, and Modeling (Theoretica Chimica Acta)*, 111(1):49–53, February 2004.
- [51] Oliver Matte and Edgardo Stockmeyer. Spectral theory of no-pair Hamiltonians. *Reviews in Mathematical Physics*, 22(01):1–53, 2010.
- [52] Albert Messiah. *Mécanique Quantique*, volume 1. Dunod, Paris, 2 edition, 1969.
- [53] E. A. Milne. The total energy of binding of a heavy atom. *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, 23(07):794–799, 1927.
- [54] Marvin H. Mittleman. Theory of relativistic effects on atoms: Configuration-space Hamiltonian. *Phys. Rev. A*, 24(3):1167–1175, September 1981.
- [55] G. Nenciu. Self-adjointness and invariance of the essential spectrum for Dirac operators defined as quadratic forms. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 48(3):235–247, 1976.
- [56] Thomas Østergaard Sørensen. *Towards a Relativistic Scott Correction*. PhD thesis, Aarhus Universitet, <http://www.imf.au.dk/cgi-bin/viewers/viewpublications.cgi?id=79>, October 1998.
- [57] Thomas Østergaard Sørensen. The large- Z behavior of pseudorelativistic atoms. *J. Math. Phys.*, 46(5):052307, 24, 2005.
- [58] Markus Reiher and Alexander Wolf. *Relativistic Quantum Chemistry: The Fundamental Theory of Molecular Science*. Wiley-VCH, Weinheim, 2009.
- [59] T. Saue and L. Visscher. Four-component electronic structure methods for molecules. In U. Kaldor and S. Wilson, editors, *Theoretical Chemistry and Physics of Heavy and Super-heavy Elements*, volume 11 of *Progress in Theoretical Chemistry and Physics*, pages 211–267. Springer Netherlands, 2003.
- [60] Trond Saue. Relativistic Hamiltonians for chemistry: A primer. *ChemPhysChem*, 12(17):3077–3094, 2011.
- [61] E. Schrödinger. Quantisierung als Eigenwertproblem (Erste Mitteilung). *Annalen der Physik*, 384(4):361–376, 1926.
- [62] Julian Schwinger. Thomas-Fermi model: The leading correction. *Phys. Rev. A*, 22(5):1827–1832, 1980.
- [63] Julian Schwinger. Thomas-Fermi model: The second correction. *Phys. Rev. A*, 24(5):2353–2361, 1981.
- [64] J. M. C. Scott. The binding energy of the Thomas-Fermi atom. *Phil. Mag.*, 43:859–867, 1952.
- [65] V M Shabaev. Generalizations of the virial relations for the Dirac equation in a central field and their applications to the Coulomb field. *Journal of Physics B: Atomic, Molecular and Optical Physics*, 24(21):4479, 1991.
- [66] Heinz Siedentop and Rudi Weikard. On the leading energy correction for the statistical model of the atom: Interacting case. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 112:471–490, 1987.
- [67] Heinz Siedentop and Rudi Weikard. Upper bound on the ground state energy of atoms that proves Scott's conjecture. *Phys. Lett. A*, 120:341–342, 1987.
- [68] Heinz Siedentop and Rudi Weikard. On the leading correction of the Thomas-Fermi model: Lower bound – with an appendix by A. M. K. Müller. *Invent. Math.*, 97:159–193, 1989.
- [69] Heinz K. H. Siedentop and Rudi Weikard. On the leading energy correction for the statistical model of the atom: Non-interacting case. *Abh. Braunschweig. Wiss. Ges.*, 38:145–158, 1986.
- [70] Jan Philip Solovej, Thomas Østergaard Sørensen, and Wolfgang L. Spitzer. The relativistic Scott correction for atoms and molecules. *Commun. Pure Appl. Math.*, 63:39–118, January 2010.

- [71] Arnold Sommerfeld. Zur Quantentheorie der Spektrallinien. *Annalen der Physik*, 356(17):1–94, 1916.
- [72] Arnold Sommerfeld. Asymptotische Integration der Differentialgleichung des Thomas-Fermischen Atoms. *Z. Phys. A*, 78:283–308, 1932.
- [73] G. Stell. Fluids with long-range forces: Toward a simple analytic theory. In Bruce J. Berne, editor, *Statistical Mechanics*, volume 5 of *Modern Theoretical Chemistry*, pages 47–84. Springer US, 1977.
- [74] J. Sucher. Foundations of the relativistic theory of many-electron atoms. *Phys. Rev. A*, 22(2):348–362, August 1980.
- [75] J. Sucher. Foundations of the relativistic theory of many-electron bound states. *International Journal of Quantum Chemistry*, 25:3–21, 1984.
- [76] J. Sucher. Relativistic many-electron Hamiltonians. *Phys. Scripta*, 36:271–281, 1987.
- [77] Bernd Thaller. *The Dirac Equation*. Texts and Monographs in Physics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1 edition, 1992.
- [78] L. H. Thomas. The calculation of atomic fields. *Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.*, 23:542–548, 1927.
E-mail address: `handrek@math.lmu.de`

E-mail address: `h.s@lmu.de`

MATHEMATISCHES INSTITUT, LUDWIG-MAXIMILIANS-UNIVERSITÄT MÜNCHEN, THERESIENSTR.
39, 80333 MÜNCHEN, GERMANY